arXiv:1112.0819v1 [math.LO] 5 Dec 2011

NICE $\aleph_1$ GENERATED NON-P-POINTS, I

SAHARON SHELAH

Abstract. We define a family of a (non-principal) ultrafilter on $\mathbb{N}$, i.e. a point which are very far from P-points. We first under reasonable conditions, prove its existence. In a continuation we shall prove that such a point may exist while no P-point exists.

Date: August 22, 2011.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* MSC 2010: Primary 03E05,54A24; Secondary: 03E35, 03E17, 54A35.

Key words and phrases. set theory, general topology, ultrafilters, P-point, forcing.

The author thanks Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing. The author thanks the National Science Foundation, Grant 0600940 and the US-Israel Binational Science Foundation, Grant 2006108 for partial support of this work. Publication 980.

Anotated Content

§0 Introduction, pg.3

§1 System of filters and well founded trees, pgs.6-9

[In 1.1 till 1.4, we deal with well founded countable trees inside a partial order M and their natural relations and subtrees. In 1.5, we define $\mathbf{K}$, the family of approximations to a system of ultrafilters. In 1.6- 1.11 we deal basic definitions and claims on $\mathbf{K}$.]

§2 Construction of an ultra-system, pgs.10-13

[We construct $\mathbf{x}$, a system of ultrafilters and show some properties.]

§3 Toward Preserving $D^{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathrm{rt}(\mathbf{x})}$, pg.14-19

[In 3.1, if $\mathbb{Q}$ is strongly bounding not shattering $[\mathbb{N}]^{\aleph_0}$ that is, adding no independent real, then any $\underset{\sim}{A} \in \mathrm{sb}_{\mathbf{x}}(B)$ is contained in or disjoint to some old $B \in \mathrm{psb}(B)$. We then deal with games related to "$\mathbb{Q}$ is strongly bounded.]

§4 On Q^2_D, pgs.20-21

[We consider a relevant forcing notion derived from an ultrafilter D on $\mathbb{N}$.]

§ 0. Introduction

P-point is an important notion in general topology and set theory of the reals. Recall here a P-point is a non-principal ultrafilter on $\mathbb{N}$ for which any countable subset has a lower bound modulo finite in the ultrafilter.

We have some knowledge on preservation of P-points by specific forcing and by say a CS iterated forcing, this is important in many applications; preservation of an ultrafilter means that the ultrafilter in the ground model $\mathbf{V}$ generate an ultrafilter in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}_\delta}$, (see [Sh:f, VI]). Of course, a forcing notion $\mathbb{Q}$ preserving P-points (i.e. all $D \in \mathbf{P}_1$, see Definition 0.3 below) preserve every ultrafilter in the closure $\mathbf{P}_2$ of $\mathbf{P}_1$ under sums.

From our point of view the P-points are trackable for independence results because:

$\boxplus_1$ (A) there are quite many forcing notions preserving P-points
  (B) a forcing notion $\mathbb{Q}$ which preserving "D being an ultrafilter" preserve its being a P-point (well, when $\mathbb{Q}$ is proper or even less)
  (C) the preservation of P-points is preserved in limit for CS-iteration (together this gives a well controlled way to have ultrafilters generated by $\aleph_1 < 2^{\aleph_0}$ sets)
  (D) we can destroy a P-point by forcing, i.e. ensure it has no extension to a P-point (so CON(no P-point))
  (E) moreover we can "split hairs", i.e. destroy some P-point while preserving others "orthogonal" to it (in the right sense), so can have unique P-point up to isomorphisms

See [Sh:f, Ch.VI,Ch.XVIII,§4] and see the survey Blass [Bla] on the various points, i.e. special ultrafilters on $\mathbb{N}$ and history there.

We may wonder:

Question 0.1. 1) Can we find other ultrafilters preserved by say enough CS- iterations of suitable forcing notions?
2) In particualr for a limit ordinal δ, having been preserved by $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ for $\alpha < \delta$ this holds for $\mathbb{P}_\delta$ when $\langle \mathbb{P}_\alpha, \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta : \alpha \leq \delta, \beta < \delta \rangle$ a CS-iteration.

We suggest this problem in [Sh:666, 3.13] and speculate about it, even building an ultrafilter on ${}^{\omega>}\omega$ naturally with many quotient. Ultrafilters as in 0.1, for natural CS iterations are naturally generated by $\aleph_1$ sets; moreover CS-iteration is mainly interesting when we start with CH, and "preserve an ultrafilter" is meaningful only when we add reals, naturally $\aleph_2$ ones.

A posteriory this seemed related to the question on the existence of a point of van-Dowen [vD84], see below but at present we do not know neither if they are related nor how to answer it. We have tried to solve the following problems:

$\boxplus_2$ (A) the one of [Sh:666, 3.13], i.e. 0.1;
  some more specific problems were raised
  (B) [Nyikos] is it consistent to have some ultrafilter $D \in \beta^*(N)\backslash\mathbb{N}$ of character $\aleph_1$, but no P-point

(*C*) [Dow] is it consistent to have $\mathfrak{u} = \aleph_1$, there is a *P*-point *D* but no *P*-point *D* with $\chi(D) = \aleph_1$,

(*D*) [van-Dowen] is it consistent that: there is no ultrafilter *D* on $\mathbb{Q}$ such that every $A \in D$ contains a member of *D* which is a closed set with no isolated points.

In the series of papers started here the main points are:

$\boxplus_3$ (*A*) we have an involved family of sets, really well founded trees, appearing in the definition

(*B*) each ultrafilter has no *P*-point as a quotient

(*C*) we have a game characterization

(*D*) such systems exists; assuming, e.g. $\diamondsuit_{\aleph_1}$

(*E*) enough relevant forcing notions preserve such systems, in particular, some serving $\boxplus_1(C)$ so answering $\boxplus_2(A)$, question 0.1(1)

(*F*) can solve Nyikos problem, see $\boxplus_2(B)$

(*G*) for Dow problem we cannot use shooting a set through an ultrafilter as this adds an unbounded real. Maybe we should try to devise a suitable creature iteration.

(*H*) we have a preservation theorem for such systems of ultrafilters under, e.g. CS-iteration, see 0.1(2), 0.1(1).

Concerning (H), really presently the condition are probably too strong but holds for many, in particularly those we consider. More specifically, ${}^\omega\omega$-bounding is necessary but we assume COM wins in the bounding games. We intend to deal with it later.

So in $\boxplus_2$ the first two problems (of myself and Nyikos) still be resolved here but not the last two (of Dow and of van-Dowen).

In the first part, i.e. the present work, first we define ultrafilters of the right kinds analgous to *P*-points but with no *P*-point as a quotient; this is done in §1,§2. In §3 we deal with necessary properties of forcing notion, intended for use in the independence results, e.g. sufficient conditions for a forcing $\mathbb{Q}$ that: for every old CWT (countable well founded tree) any colouring of the maximal nodes, by 2 colours (in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{Q}}$) contains a monochromatic positive subtree.

In §4 we start to deal with the kind of forcing notion we would like to iterate.

In the second part (presently the first half of [Sh:F1127]) we present those ultrafilters in a more general framework and deal with sufficient conditions for such an ultrafilter to generate an ultrafilter in a suitable generic extension. For the limit case we continue the proof of preservation theorems in [Sh:f], in particular [Sh:f, Ch.VI,1.26,1.27] and Case A with transitivity of [Sh:f, Ch.XVIII,§3]. For the successor case we need that the relevant forcing, $\mathbb{Q}^3_D$, preserve our ultrafilters. We conclude finishing the proof fo CON($\mathfrak{u} = \aleph_1 +$ no *P*-points).

In the third part (in what should be the second half of [Sh:F1127]) we note that the ultrafilters so far were really analogous to selective (= Ramsey) ultrafilters and give more general framework which really includes *P*-points.

We thank Alan Dow for asking me about $\boxplus_2(B), (C)$ and for some comments.

Remark 0.2. There may be *P*-point while $\mathfrak{d} > \aleph_1$, see Blass-Shelah [BsSh:242] and references there, but the existence of ultrafilters in the direction here, far from *P*-point, implies $\mathfrak{d} = \aleph_1$, see the survey of Blass [Bla]. But note that the ultrafilter may be $\aleph_1$-generated in a different sense: union of $\aleph_1$ families of the form $\mathrm{fil}(B) \cap \mathscr{P}(\max(B))$, see 1.2(3E).

Note that it may be harder (than in the P-point case) to build such ultrafilters as here which are μ-generated instead of $\aleph_1$-generated because of the unbounded countable depth involved. We have not looked at this as well as at the natural variants of our definition (not to speak of generalization to reasonable ultrafilters (see [Sh:830] and Roslanowski-Shelah [RoSh:890]).

Originally the idea was to have a system of ultrafilters on $\mathbb{N}$ rather than one. We have nice argument for the naturality of and interest in this approach but eventually we have to discard it, still the system of trees $A^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta, \eta \neq \eta^{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathrm{tr}}$ remains.

Our strategy was to build a system $\langle D_t : t \in T\rangle$ of ultrafilters by a sequence of countable approximations, for each approximation $\mathbf{x}, D^{\mathbf{x}}_t$ look like a member of $\mathbf{P}_2$. We try to use games in which more and more of the ultrafilters are involved, thinking that games will help in the preservation. Another possible way to prove preservation, was using this and nep and faking (see [Sh:630]) we have tried to show that those ultrafilters are preserved by forcing notion which preserve P-points (and are nep enough), i.e. preserve each D_t by faking: the faking is reasonable as our ultrafilters locally (i.e. in some countable N) look like members of $\mathbf{P}_2$. This has not worked out, still we mention those original definitions.

Definition 0.3. 1) Let $\mathbf{P}_1$ be the set of P-points, which are ultrafilters on countable sets, $\mathbf{P}_2$ its closure under sums.
2) We say D is a Q-point when D is an ultrafilter on a countable set $\mathrm{Dom}(D)$ such that if f is a finite-to-one function with domain $\mathrm{Dom}(D)$, then $f{\restriction}A$ is one-to-one for some $A \in D$.
3) [The Rudin-Keisler order on ultrafilters.] We let D_ℓ be an ultrafilter on $\mathscr{U}_\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2$. We say $D_1 \leq_{\mathrm{RK}} D_2$ iff some function h witness it which means:

- $\mathrm{Dom}(h) \in D_2$
- $\mathrm{Rang}(h) \in D_1$ and
- $A \in D_1 \Leftrightarrow \{a \in \mathrm{Dom}(h) : h(a) \in A\} \in D_2$ for every $A \subseteq \mathscr{U}_1$.

Definition 0.4. For $\mathscr{X} \subseteq \mathscr{P}(\mathbb{N})$ let $\mathrm{fil}(\mathscr{X})$ be the filter on $\mathbb{N}$ generated by $\mathscr{X}$ and the co-finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$.

§ 1. System of filters using well founded trees

Notation 1.1. M is a partial order, T is tree here means in the model theoretic sense, i.e. for every $\eta \in T$ the set $\{\nu \in T : \nu <_T \eta\}$ is linearly ordered by $<_T$ but not necessarily well founded. Here B denotes a subset of T or of a partial order M inheriting its order.
1) For $B \subseteq M, \max_M(B) = \{\eta \in B : B \cap M_{>\eta} = \emptyset\}$.
2) We say Y is a front of $B \subseteq M$ when $Y \subseteq B$ and every branch of B meet Y and the members of Y are pairwise $<_M$-incomparable.
3) $\mathrm{suc}_B(\eta) = \mathrm{suc}(\eta, B) = \mathrm{suc}_T(\eta, B) = \{\nu \in B : \eta <_T \nu$ but for no $\rho \in B$ do we have $\eta <_M \rho <_M \nu\}$; below we may write $\mathrm{suc}_M(\eta, B)$ or $\mathrm{suc}_{\mathbf{x}}(\eta, B)$ when $B \subseteq M$ or $B \subseteq M_{\mathbf{x}}$.
4) $B_{\geq \eta} = \{\nu \in B : \eta \leq \nu\}$ and similarly $B_{>\eta}$ for $\eta \in B$.

Definition 1.2. For a partial order M; writing $\mathbf{x}$ instead of M means $M_{\mathbf{x}}$, see Definition 1.5.
1) Let $\mathrm{CWT}(M)$ be the set of $B \subseteq M$ such that (CWT stands for countable well-founded sub-tree):

- (a) B is a countable subset of M
- (b) B has a $<_M$-minimal member called its root, $\mathrm{rt}(B)$
- (c) B, i.e. $(B, <_M \restriction B)$ is a tree with $\leq \omega$ levels (so well ordered!) and no ω-branch
- (d) for each $\nu \in B$ the set $\mathrm{suc}_B(\nu) = \{\rho \in B : \nu <_T \rho$ and $\neg(\exists \rho)(\nu <_T \rho <_T \rho)\}$ is empty or infinite.

2) For $B \in \mathrm{CWT}(M)$ let: $\mathrm{frt}(B) = \mathrm{frt}_M(B) = \mathrm{frt}(B, <_M \restriction B)$ be the set of fronts I of B, which in this case means maximal set of pairwise incomparable members.
2A) For antichains Y_1, Y_2 of M we say Y_2 is above Y_1 when $(\forall \eta \in Y_2)(\exists \nu \in Y_1)[\nu \leq_M \eta]$ and this will be used mainly for $Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathrm{frt}(B), B \in \mathrm{CWT}(M)$.
2B) For Y_1, Y_2 as above let the projection $h_{Y_1,Y_2} : Y_2 \to Y_1$ be the unique function h such that $h(\eta) \leq_M \eta$ for $\eta \in Y_2$.
2C) If Y_1, Y_2 are from $\mathrm{frt}(B)$ then Y_2 is almost above Y_1 when for some $B' \in \mathrm{sb}(B)$, see below, $B' \cap Y_2$ is above $B' \cap Y_1$, still we can define h_{Y_1,Y_2} but its domain is not Y_2 but $\{\eta \in Y_2 : (\exists \nu \in Y_1)(\nu \leq_M \eta)\}$.
3) For $B \in \mathrm{CWT}(M)$ let $\mathrm{sb}_M(B)$ be the set of exhaustive subtrees B' of B where B' is an exhaustive subtree of B when:

- (a) $B' \subseteq B$
- (b) $\mathrm{rt}(B') = \mathrm{rt}(B)$
- (c) if $\nu \in B'$ then $\mathrm{suc}_B(\nu) \backslash \mathrm{suc}_{B'}(\nu)$ is finite.

3A) For $B \in \mathrm{CWT}(M)$ and $Y \in \mathrm{frt}_M(B)$ let $D_{B,Y} = D_{M,B,Y}$ be the filter on Y generated by $E_{B,I} = E_{M,B,I} := \{Y \cap B' : B'$ is an exhaustive subtree of B, i.e. $\in \mathrm{sb}_M(B)\}$.
3B) For B as above and $Y \subseteq B$ let $B[\leq Y] = \{\nu \in B : (\exists \eta)(\nu \leq_T \eta \in Y\}$.
3C) In part (3), we say f witness "$B' \in \mathrm{sb}(B)$" if $f : B' \backslash \max(B) \to [B]^{<\aleph_0}$ satisfies $\nu \in B' \backslash \max(B) \Rightarrow \mathrm{suc}_B(\nu) \backslash \mathrm{suc}_{B'}(\nu) \subseteq f(\nu)$ so only $f \restriction B'$; in fact only $f \restriction B'[\leq Y]$ matters when we are interested in $D_{M,B,Y}$.

3D) For $B \in \mathrm{CWT}(M)$ let $\mathrm{psb}_M(B), p$ for positive, be the set of positive subtrees B' of B which means (a),(b) as in part (3) above and

$(c)'$ if $\nu \in B' \backslash \max(B)$ then $\mathrm{suc}_{B'}(\nu)$ is infinite.

3E) For B as above let $\mathrm{fil}_M(B) = \{X \subseteq B : X$ contains some $B' \in \mathrm{sb}_M(B)\}$.
4) Let $\mathrm{alm}-\mathrm{frt}(B) = \mathrm{alm}-\mathrm{frt}_M(B)$ be the set of almost fronts of B, i.e. set of $Y \subseteq M$ an antichain such that $Y \cap B'$ is a front of B' for some $B' \in \mathrm{sb}(B)$.
4A) For $Y \in \mathrm{alm}-\mathrm{frt}_M(B)$ let $\mathrm{fil}_M(X, B) = \{X \subseteq Y$: for some $B' \in \mathrm{sb}_M(B)$ we have $X \supseteq B' \cap Y\}$; if $M = B$ we may write $\mathrm{fil}(Y, B)$ or $\mathrm{fil}_B(Y)$.
5) Let $\le^*_M$ be the following two-place relation (actually a partial order) on $\mathrm{CWT}(M)$:
$B_1 \le^*_M B_2$ iff ($B_1, B_2 \in \mathrm{CWT}(M)$ and) $\mathrm{rt}(B_1) = \mathrm{rt}(B_2)$ and for some $B'_2 \in \mathrm{sb}_M(B_2)$, we have

(a) $B'_2 \cap B_1 \in \mathrm{psb}(B_1)$
(b) every almost front of $B'_2 \cap B_1$ is an almost front of B_2.

5A) The default value of $Y \in \mathrm{frt}(B)$ is $\max(B) = \{\nu \in B : \nu$ is $<_M$-maximal in $B\}$.
5B) For $B \in \mathrm{CTW}(M)$ let $\mathrm{qsb}_M(B) = \{B' \in \mathrm{CWT}(M) : B \le^*_M B'\}$.
6) $\mathrm{Dp}_M(B)$ is the depth of B, i.e. $\mathrm{Dp}_M(B) = \sup\{\mathrm{Dp}_M(B_{\ge\eta}) + 1 : \nu \in B \backslash \{\mathrm{rt}_M(B)\}\}$.

Remark 1.3. We may use more almost fronts.

Observation 1.4. Let M be a partial order.
1) We have $B_1 \le^*_M B_2$ iff ($B_1, B_2 \in \mathrm{CWT}(M)$ and) every almost front Y_1 of B_1 is an almost front of B_2.
2) For $B \in \mathrm{CWT}(M)$, $\max(B)$ is a front of B and also $\{\mathrm{rt}(B)\}$ is.
3) Every front of $B \in \mathrm{CWT}(M)$ is an almost front of B.
4) If $B \in \mathrm{CWT}(M)$ then $\mathrm{Dp}_M(B)$ is a countable ordinal.

Proof. Straight. $\square_{1.4}$

Definition 1.5. Let $\mathbf{K}$ be the class of the objects $\mathbf{x}$ which consists of the following objects satisfying the following properties:

(a) $\bar{\mathscr{A}}_{\mathbf{x}} = \bar{\mathscr{A}} = \langle \mathscr{A}_\eta : \eta \in M\rangle = \langle \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta : \eta \in M_{\mathbf{x}}\rangle$ and $\mathscr{A}_{\mathbf{x}} = \cup\{\mathscr{A}_\eta : \eta \in M^-_{\mathbf{x}}\}$
(b) $M = M_{\mathbf{x}} = M[\mathbf{x}]$ is a partial order with a root $\mathrm{rt}_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathrm{rt}(\mathbf{x})$ so the partial order is $<_M = <_{M[\mathbf{x}]}$; and let $M^-_{\mathbf{x}} = M_{\mathbf{x}} \backslash \{\mathrm{rt}_{\mathbf{x}}\}$
(c) $\mathscr{A}_\eta \subseteq \mathrm{CWT}(M)$, let $\mathscr{A}^-_\eta = \mathscr{A}_\eta \backslash \{\{\eta\}\}$
(d) $\mathrm{rt}(B) = \eta$ for every $B \in \mathscr{A}_\eta$
(e) $\mathscr{A}_\eta$ is not empty, in fact $\{\eta\} \in \mathscr{A}_\eta$
(f) $\mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathrm{rt}(\mathbf{x})}$ and $\le_{\mathbf{x}}$ is a directed partial order on $\mathscr{B}_\eta$ for $\eta = \mathrm{rt}_{\mathbf{x}}$
(g) $B_1 \le_{\mathbf{x}} B_2$ implies $B_1 \le^*_T B_2$, see 1.2(5) and, of course, $B_1, B_2 \in \mathscr{A}_{\mathrm{rt}(\mathbf{x})}$
(h) (α) if $\nu \in B \in \mathscr{A}_\eta$ then $B \cap M_{\ge\nu} \in \mathscr{A}_\nu$
  (β) if $\nu \in B \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\nu \ne \mathrm{rt}_{\mathbf{x}}$ then $B_{\ge\nu} \in \mathscr{A}_\nu$.

Definition 1.6. Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}$ and $\eta \in M_{\mathbf{x}}$; below we may omit $\mathbf{x}$ when clear from the context.
1) Let $\mathrm{frt}(\eta) = \mathrm{frt}_{\mathbf{x}}(\eta) = \{Y : Y$ is a front of B for some $B \in \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta\}$ (and $\mathrm{frt}_{\mathbf{x}}(B)$ similarly). Omitting η means $\eta = \mathrm{rt}_{\mathbf{x}}$.

2) Let $\text{frt}^-(\eta) = \{Y \in \text{frt}(\eta) : Y \neq \{\eta\}\}$. Similarly $\text{alm}-\text{frt}_{\mathbf{x}}(\eta)$, using 1.2(4).
3) Let $\text{Fin}_{\mathbf{x}}(B) = \{f : f$ is a function with domain $B \backslash \max(B)$ such that $f(\nu) \in [\text{suc}_B(\nu)]^{<\aleph_0}\}$ and let $A_f = A_{B,f} = A_{\mathbf{x},B,f} = \{\eta \in B$: if $\rho <_T \varrho \leq_T \eta$ and $\varrho \in \text{suc}_B(\rho)$ so $\rho, \varrho \in B$ then $\varrho \notin f(\rho)\}$. Recall 1.2(3C).
3A) Assume $Y \in \text{frt}_{\mathbf{x}}$ say $Y \in \text{frt}(B_1)$ or just $Y \in \text{alm}-\text{frt}_{\mathbf{x}}(B_1), B_1 \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}}$; we let $D_Y = D^{\mathbf{x}}_Y = D_{\mathbf{x}}(Y)$ (see 1.7(2)) be the filter on Y generated by $\{B \cap Y \cap A_{B,f} : B \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}}$ is $B_1 \leq_{\mathbf{x}} B$ and $f \in \text{Fin}_{\mathbf{x}}(B)\}$.
3B) Also if $B \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}}, Y \subseteq M$ and Y is an almost front of B then $D_Y = D^{\mathbf{x}}_Y$ is $\{Z \subseteq Y$: for some $B \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $B' \in \text{sb}(B)$ we have $Y \in \text{alm}-\text{frt}$ of B and $B' \cap Y \subseteq Z\}$; we could use $A_{B,f}$'s as in (3A) and vice versa.
3C) Lastly, if $B \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}}$ then $D^{\mathbf{x}}_B = D_{\mathbf{x}}(B) = D_{\mathbf{x}}(\max(B))$.
4) If $\eta \in M_{\mathbf{x}}, B \in \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta$ let $\text{Dp}_{\mathbf{x}}(B)$ be $\text{Dp}_{T_{\mathbf{x}}}(B)$ as defined in 1.2(6) and let $\text{Dp}_{\mathbf{x}}(\eta) = \sup\{\text{Dp}_{\mathbf{x}}(B) + 1 : B \in \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta\}$.

Observation 1.7. Assume $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}, \eta = \text{rt}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $Y \in \text{frt}_{\mathbf{x}}$.
1) $\{\eta\} \in \text{frt}_{\mathbf{x}}(\eta)$ and $D^{\mathbf{x}}_{\{\eta\}} = \{\{\eta\}\}$ (and η is uniquely determined).
2) D_Y is a filter on Y.
3) If $B \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $Y_1, Y_2 \in \text{frt}_{\mathbf{x}}(B)$ and Y_2 is above Y_1 and $h : Y_2 \to Y_1$ is the projection, i.e. $h(\nu_2) = \nu_1 \Leftrightarrow \nu_1 \in Y_1 \wedge \nu_2 \in Y_2 \wedge \nu_1 \leq_T \nu_2$, see 1.2(2B); then $h(D_{Y_2}) = D_{Y_1}$ so h witnesses $D_{Y_1} \leq_{\text{RK}} D_{Y_2}$, i.e. $D_{Y_1} = \{A_1 \subseteq Y_1$: for some $A_2 \in D_2, \{h(\eta) : \eta \in A_2 \cap h^{-1}(Y_1)\} = A_1\}$, in particular $\text{Rang}(h) \in D_{Y_1}$, see part (4).
4) If $B_1 \leq_{\mathbf{x}} B_2$ and $Y_1 \in \text{frt}(B_1)$ and $Y_2 = Y_1 \cap B_2$ hence $\in \text{alm}-\text{frt}_{\mathbf{x}}(B_2)$ then $Y_2 \in D^{\mathbf{x}}_{Y_1}$ and $D^{\mathbf{x}}_{Y_2} = D^{\mathbf{x}}_{Y_1} \restriction Y_2$.
5) If $B_1 \leq_{\mathbf{x}} B_2$ and $Y_\ell = \text{suc}_{\mathbf{x}}(\eta, B_\ell)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ then:

- (a) Y_ℓ is a front of $(B_\ell)_{\geq \eta}$ and Y_1 almost above Y_2, see 1.2(2C)
- (b) if Y is a front of $(B_\ell)_{\geq \eta}$ and $\neq \{\eta\}$ then Y is above Y_ℓ.

6) $\max(B)$ is the maximal front of B which means that it is above any other.
7) If $\mathbb{Q}$ is an ${}^\omega\omega$-bounding forcing, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}, B \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}}$ then for any $B' \in \text{sb}_{\mathbf{x}}(B)^{\mathbf{V}[\mathbb{Q}]}$ there is $B'' \in (\text{sb}_{\mathbf{x}}(B))^{\mathbf{V}}$ such that $B'' \subseteq B'$.

Proof. 1) By the definition.
2)-8) Also easy. $\square_{1.7}$

Definition 1.8. 1) For an (infinite) cardinal κ let $\mathbf{K}_{<\kappa}$ be the class of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}$ such that $\|\mathbf{x}\| := |M_{\mathbf{x}}| + \Sigma\{|\mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta| : \eta \in M_{\mathbf{x}}\} < \kappa$, similarly $\mathbf{K}_{\leq \kappa}$.
2) $\leq_{\mathbf{K}}$ is the following two-place relation on $\mathbf{K}$; (it is a partial order, see 1.9 below): $\mathbf{x} \leq_{\mathbf{K}} \mathbf{y}$ iff:

- (a) $M_{\mathbf{x}} \subseteq M_{\mathbf{y}}$ (as partial orders)
- (b) $\eta \in M_{\mathbf{x}} \Rightarrow \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta \subseteq \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{y}}_\eta$
- (c) $\text{rt}_{\mathbf{y}} = \text{rt}_{\mathbf{x}}$, really follows by (d)
- (d) $\leq_{\mathbf{x}} = \leq_{\mathbf{y}} \restriction \mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}}$.

3) If $\langle \mathbf{x}_\alpha : \alpha < \delta \rangle$ is a $\leq_{\mathbf{K}}$-increasing sequence we define $\mathbf{x}_\delta = \cup\{\mathbf{x}_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\}$, the union of the sequence by $M_{\mathbf{x}_\delta} = \cup\{M_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha} : \alpha < \delta\}$ as partial orders and $\mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}_\delta}_\eta = \cup\{\mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}_\alpha}_\eta : \alpha < \delta$ satisfies $\eta \in M_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha}\}$ and $\leq_{\mathbf{x}_\delta} = \cup\{\leq_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha} : \alpha < \delta\}$.
4) We say $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}$ is principal when there is a B such that $B \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}}$ is $\leq_{\mathbf{x}}$-maximal.
5) We say $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}$ is countable when $\|\mathbf{x}\| \leq \aleph_0$.

6) $\mathbf{K}_{\mathrm{uf}}$ is the class of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}$ such that $D^{\mathbf{x}}_B$ is an ultrafilter on $\max(B)$ for every $B \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}}$.

Claim 1.9. *1) $\le_{\mathbf{K}}$ is really a partial order.*
2) If $\langle \mathbf{x}_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\rangle$ is $\le_{\mathbf{K}}$-increasing then $\mathbf{x}_\delta$, the union of the sequence is a $\le_{\mathbf{K}}$-lub of the sequence and $\|\mathbf{x}_\delta\| \le \Sigma\|\{\|\mathbf{x}_\alpha\| : \alpha < \delta\}$.

Remark 1.10. 1) We can use $\le^+_{\mathbf{K}}$: $\mathbf{x} \le^+_{\mathbf{K}} \mathbf{y}$ iff $\mathbf{x} \le_{\mathbf{K}} \mathbf{y}$ and if $B_2 \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{y}} \backslash \mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $B_1 \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}}$ then $B_1 \le^+_{\mathbf{x}} B_2$ where
2) $B_1 \le^+_{\mathbf{x}} B_2$ when for some $B'_1 \in \mathrm{sb}_{\mathbf{x}}(B_1)$ we have $\eta \in B_2 \cap B'_1 \wedge \eta <_T \nu \in B_2 \cap B'_1 \Rightarrow \nu \in B_2 \cap B'_1$.

We can use "fat" $\mathbf{x}$, this is natural for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}_{\aleph_1}$ when $\mathfrak{d} = \aleph_1$.

Definition 1.11. 1) We say $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}$ is fat when: if $B \in \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta$ and $B' \in \mathrm{sb}(B)$ then there is $B'' \in \mathrm{sb}(B')$ which belongs to $\mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta$ and $\eta = \mathrm{rt}_{\mathbf{x}} \Rightarrow B \le_{\mathbf{x}} B''$.
2) We say that $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}$ is strongly big when: if $B \in \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta$ where $\eta \in M_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\mathbf{c} : \max(B) \to \{0,1\}$ then for some $B' \in \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta$ we have $B' \in \mathrm{psb}(B) \cap \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta$, $\mathbf{c}{\restriction}\max(B')$ is constant and $\eta = \mathrm{rt}_{\mathbf{x}} \Rightarrow B \le_{\mathbf{x}} B'$.
2A) We say $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}$ is weakly big when in part (2) we restrict ourselves to $\eta \in M^-_{\mathbf{x}}$.
3) We say $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}$ is strongly large when if $B \in \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta$ where $\eta \in M_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\mathbf{c}$ is a function with domain $\max(B)$ then for some $B' \in \mathrm{psb}(B) \cap \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta$ and front$Y$ of B' we have $\mathbf{c}(\eta) = \mathbf{c}(\nu)$ iff for every $\eta, \nu \in \max(B')$ we have $\mathbf{c}(\eta) = \mathbf{c}(\nu) \Leftrightarrow (\exists \rho \in Y)(\rho \le_{M_{\mathbf{x}}} \eta \wedge \rho \le_{M_{\mathbf{x}}} \nu)$.
3A) We say $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}$ is weakly large when in part (3) we restrict ourselves to $\eta \in M^-_{\mathbf{x}}$.
4) We say $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}$ is full when: if $\eta \in M^-_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $B \in \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta$ then $\mathrm{psb}_{\mathbf{x}}(B) \subseteq \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta$.

[repetition: naturally related is (see 3.3).]

Definition 1.12. 1) We say $\mathscr{P} \subseteq [\mathbb{N}]^{\aleph_0}$ is big when for every $\mathbf{c} : \mathbb{N} \to \{0,1\}$ there is $A \in \mathscr{P}$ such that $\mathbf{c}{\restriction}A$ is constant.
2) For $B \in \mathrm{CTW}({}^{\omega>}\omega, \Delta)$ we say $\mathscr{B} \subseteq \mathrm{psb}(B)$ is big (in B) when for every $\mathbf{c} : \max(B) \to \{0,1\}$ there is $B' \in \mathscr{B}$ such that $\mathbf{c}{\restriction}\max(B')$ is constant.
3) For $B \in \mathrm{CTW}({}^{\omega>}\omega, \lhd)$ we say $\mathscr{B} \subseteq \mathrm{psb}(B)$ is large (in B) when for every function $\mathbf{c}$ with domain $\max(B)$ there is $B' \in \mathscr{B}$ and front Y of B' such that for every $\eta, \nu \in \max(B')$ we have $\mathbf{c}(\eta) = \mathbf{c}(\nu) \Leftrightarrow (\exists \rho \in Y)(\rho \le_B \nu \hat{\ } \rho \le_B \eta)$.

§ 2. CONSTRUCTION OF ULTRA-SYSTEMS AND GAMES

Claim 2.1. *$\mathbf{K}_{\le\aleph_0}$ is non-empty.*

Proof. Let $M_{\mathbf{x}} = \{\eta_*\}, \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_{\eta_*} = \{\{\eta_*\}\}$, $\mathrm{rt}_{\mathbf{x}} = \eta_*$.

Now it is easy to check. $\square_{2.1}$

Claim 2.2. *If $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}$ and $\eta \in M_{\mathbf{x}}$ satisfies $|\mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta| = 1$, i.e. $\mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta = \{\{\eta\}\}$ then for some $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{K}$ we have $\mathbf{x} \le_{\mathbf{K}} \mathbf{y}, |\mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{y}}_\eta| > 1$ and $\|\mathbf{y}\| \le \|\mathbf{x}\| + \aleph_0$.*

Proof. Let $\langle \eta_n : n < \omega\rangle$ be pairwise distinct and $\notin T_{\mathbf{x}}$. We define $\mathbf{y}$ by:

- (a) $T_{\mathbf{y}}$ has set of elements $M_{\mathbf{x}} \cup \{\eta_n : n < \omega\}$
- (b) $\nu <_{\mathbf{y}} \rho$ if $\nu <_{T_{\mathbf{x}}} \rho$ or $\nu \le_{\mathbf{x}} \eta \wedge (\exists n)(\rho = \eta_n)$
- (c) $\mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{y}}_\nu$ is:
  - (α) $\mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\nu$ when $\nu \in M_{\mathbf{x}}\backslash\{\eta\}$
  - (β) $\{\{\eta\}, \{\eta_n : n < \omega\} \cup \{\eta\}\}$ when $\nu = \eta$
  - (γ) $\{\{\eta_n\}\}$ when $\nu = \eta_n$
- (d) the order $<_{\mathbf{y}}$ is $<_{\mathbf{x}}$ if $\eta \ne \mathrm{rt}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\{(\{\eta\}, \{\eta_n : n < \omega\} \cup \{\eta\})\}$ if $\eta = \mathrm{rt}_{\mathbf{x}}$.

Now check. $\square_{2.2}$

Claim 2.3. *1) If $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}_{\le\aleph_0}$ then for some $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{K}_{\le\aleph_0}$ we have $\mathbf{x} \le_{\mathbf{K}} \mathbf{y}$ and in $\mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{y}}$ there is a $\le_{\mathbf{y}}$-maximal member.*
2) If $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}_{\le\aleph_0}$ and some $B \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}}$ is $\le_{\mathbf{x}}$-maximal then for some $\mathbf{y}$ and B' we have $\mathbf{x} \le \mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{K}_{\le\aleph_0}, B' \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{y}}$ and $B <_{\mathbf{y}} B'$.
3) If $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}_{\aleph_0}, \eta \in M_{\mathbf{x}}, B_1 \in \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta$ and $B_2 \in \mathrm{psb}_{\mathbf{x}}(B_1)$ then there is $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{K}_{\le\aleph_0}$ such that $x \le_{\mathbf{K}} y$ and $B_2 \in \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{y}}_\eta$.

Proof. 1) If in $(\mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}}, \le_{\mathbf{x}})$ there is a maximal member then we let $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x}$. Otherwise, as it is directed (see clause (f) of Definition 1.5) and $\|\mathbf{x}\| \le \aleph_0$ because $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}_{\le\aleph_0}$, there is a $<_{\mathbf{x}}$-increasing cofinal sequence $\langle B_n : n < \omega\rangle$. Let $Y_n = \mathrm{suc}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathrm{rt}_{\mathbf{x}}, B_n)$.

Note that for each $n, \langle Y_m \cap B_n : m \le n\rangle$ is a sequence of almost fronts of B_n. So when $m_1 < m_2 \le n$ we have $Y_{m_1} \cap B_n$ is almost above $Y_{m_2} \cap B_n$, hence for some $B_{m_1,m_2,n} \in \mathrm{sb}_{\mathbf{x}}(B_n)$ we have "$Y_{m_1} \cap B_{m_1,m_2,n}$ is above Y_{m_2}". Let $B^*_n := \cap\{B_{m_1,m_2,n} : m_1 < m_2 \le n\}$, clearly B^*_n belongs to $\mathrm{sb}_{\mathbf{x}}(B_n)$.

We now choose $\bar\nu_n = \langle \nu_{n,\ell} : \ell \le n\rangle$ by induction on $n < \omega$ such that

⊛ (a) $\nu_{n,\ell} \in Y_\ell \cap B^*_\ell$
  (b) $\nu_{n,\ell+1} \le_M \nu_{n,\ell}$
  (c) $\nu_{n+1,m_1}, \nu_{n_1,m_2}$ are $<_M$-incomparable for $n_1 \le n, m_1 \le n+1, m_2 \le n_1$.

This is easy.

Now let $B_* = \{\eta\} \cup \{B_n \cap M_{\ge \nu_{n,n}} : n < \omega\}$.

Lastly, we define $\mathbf{y}$:

⊛ (a) $M_{\mathbf{y}} = M_{\mathbf{x}}$
  (b) $\mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{y}}_\nu = \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\nu$ when $\nu \in M_{\mathbf{x}}\backslash\{\eta\}$
  (c) $\mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{y}}_\eta = \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta \cup \{B_*\}$
  (d) $B_1 \le^{\mathbf{y}}_\eta B_2$ iff $B_1 \le^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta B_2$ or $B_1 \in A^{\mathbf{y}}_\eta \wedge B_2 = B_*$ or $B_1 = B_2 = B_*$.

Now check.
2) Similarly to part (1) just easier and follows by 2.4 below.
3) Easy. $\square_{2.3}$

Claim 2.4. *1) If* $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}_{\le \aleph_0}, Y \in \mathrm{alm} - \mathrm{frt}_{\mathbf{x}}$ *and* $Z \subseteq Y$ *then for some* $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{K}_{\le \aleph_0}$ *we have* $\mathbf{x} \le_{\mathbf{K}} \mathbf{y}$ *and* $Z \in D^{\mathbf{y}}_Y \vee (Y \backslash Z) \in D^{\mathbf{y}}_Y$.
2) Moreover, if h *is a function with domain* Y *then above we can demand that for some* $B \in \mathscr{A}_{\mathbf{y}}, Y \cap B$ *is a front of* B *and for some front* Y' *of* B *which is below* Y *and a one-to-one function* h' *with domain* Y' *we have* $\rho \in Y' \wedge \varrho \in Y \cap B \wedge \rho \le_T \varrho \Rightarrow h(\rho) = h'(\varrho)$*, note that possibly* $Y' = \{\eta\}$ *so* $h{\restriction}(Y \cap B)$ *is constant.*

Proof. 1) By 2.3(1) without loss of generality there is $B \in \mathscr{A}_{\mathbf{x}}$ such that B is $\le_{\mathbf{x}}$-maximal in $\mathscr{A}_{\mathbf{x}}$; clearly $Y \cap B$ is an almost front of B and so without loss of generality $Y \subseteq B$.

We know that $B[\le Y]$ has no ω-branch, so by $<_{T_{\mathbf{x}}}$-downward induction on $\nu \in B[\le Y] = \{\rho \in B : (\exists \nu)[\rho \le_{T_{\mathbf{v}}} \nu \in Y]\}$ we choose $(\mathbf{t}_\nu, Y_\nu)$ such that (where $T = T_{\mathbf{x}}$, of course):

- (a) $\mathbf{t}_\nu \in \{\text{yes, no}\}$ or $\{0,1\}$
- (b) • $Y_\nu \subseteq M_{\ge \nu} \cap Z$ if $\mathbf{t}_\nu =$ yes,
  - • $Y_\nu \subseteq M_{\ge \nu} \cap (Y \backslash Z)$ if $\mathbf{t}_\nu = \text{no}$
- (c) $Y_\nu = \max(B'_\nu)$ for some $B'_\nu \in \mathrm{psb}(B_{\ge \nu})$
- (d) if $\nu \in Y$ then $Y_\nu = \{\nu\}$ and $\mathbf{t}_\nu =$ (the truth value of $\nu \in Z$)
- (e) if $\nu \in B[\le Y] \backslash Y$ then
  - (α) $\mathbf{t}_\nu = \min\{\mathbf{t}$: the set $\{\rho \in \mathrm{Suc}_{\mathbf{x}}(\nu, B) : \mathbf{t}_\rho = \mathbf{t}\}$ is infinite$\}$
  - (β) $Y_\nu = \cup\{Y_\rho : \rho \in \mathrm{suc}_B(\nu)$ and $\mathbf{t}_\rho = \mathbf{t}_\nu\}$.

This is easily done and so $\mathbf{t}_\eta$ is well defined. For $\nu \in B[\le Y]$ we let $B^*_\nu = \{\rho \in B_{\ge \nu}$: for some $\varrho \in Y_\nu$ we have $\varrho \le_T \rho \vee \rho \le_{T_{\mathbf{x}}} \varrho\}$. Now define $\mathbf{y}$ by adding B^*_ν to $\mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\nu$ for every $\nu \in B[\le Y]$, and check.
2) Similarly noting: if $h : Y \to A, Y \in \mathrm{frt}(B), Z = \{\eta \in B; \mathrm{suc}_B(\eta) \subseteq Y\}$ and $\eta \in Z \Rightarrow h{\restriction}\mathrm{suc}_B(\eta)$ is one-to-one then we can find $B' \in \mathrm{psb}(B)$ such that: $h{\restriction}B' \cap Z$ is one-to-one. $\square_{2.4}$

We can conclude

Conclusion 2.5. *Assume CH.*
There is a $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}$ *such that:*

- (a) (α) $\mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta \ne \{\{\eta\}\}$ *for* $\eta \in M_{\mathbf{x}}$
  - (β) $\mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathrm{rt}(\mathbf{x})}$ *is* $\aleph_1$*-directed under* $\le_{\mathbf{x}}$
- (b) *if* $B \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}}$ *and* $Y \in \mathrm{frt}_{\mathbf{x}}(B)$ *then*
  - (α) $D^{\mathbf{x}}_Y$ *is an ultrafilter on* Y
  - (β) *it is a non-principal ultrafilter iff* $Y \ne \{\mathrm{rt}_{\mathbf{x}}\}$
- (c) *if* $B_1 \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}}$ *then for some* $B_2 \in \mathscr{A}_{\mathbf{x}}$ *we have* $B_1 \le_{\mathbf{x}} B_2$ *and* $B_1 \cap \mathrm{suc}_{B_2}(\mathrm{rt}_{\mathbf{x}}) = \emptyset$*, moreover*[1] $(\forall \varrho \in \mathrm{suc}_{B_2}(\mathrm{rt}_{\mathbf{x}}))(\exists^\infty \rho \in \mathrm{suc}_{B_1}(\mathrm{rt}_{\mathbf{x}}))[\varrho \le_{M_{\mathbf{x}}} \rho]$.

We may add

---

[1] Not a serious addition. As always, the number of $\varrho \in \mathrm{suc}_{B_2}(\mathrm{rt}_{\mathbf{x}})$ failing this is finite.

(*d*) *if* $\eta \in M_{\mathbf{x}}, B \in \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta$ *and* $Y \in \mathrm{frt}_{\mathbf{x}}(\eta)$ *then* $B[\leq Y] \in \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta$

(*e*) *if* $\eta \in M_{\mathbf{x}}, B_1 \in \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta$ *and* $h : \max(B_1) \to \omega$ *then there is* $B_2 \in A^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta$ *such that* $\max(B_1) \cap B_2$ *is a front of* B_2 *and* $(Y; h')$ *is as in 2.4(2)*

(*f*) *if* $B \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}}$ *and* $B_\nu \in \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\nu$ *for every* $\nu \in \max(B)$ *then there is* $B' \in \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta$ *such that* $B \leq^*_{\mathbf{x}} B'$ *and* $\nu \in \max(B) \cap B' \Rightarrow B_\nu \in \mathrm{sb}(B'_{\geq \nu})$

(*g*) $D^{\mathbf{x}}_Y$ *is a Q-point, see Definition 0.3(2)*

(*h*) $\mathbf{x}$ *is*

- (α) *fat*
- (β) *strongly big (follows by (e))*
- (γ) *strongly large*
- (δ) *full.*

Proof. Straight.

For $(b)(\gamma)$ think of the proof of 2.4(2). $\square_{2.5}$

Definition 2.6. 1) Let $\mathbf{K}_{\mathrm{ut}}$ be the class of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}$ which are ultra which means $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}_g \cap \mathbf{K}_u$, see below.
2) Let $\mathbf{K}_r$ be the set of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}$ which are reasonable which means (a),(c) of 2.5 holds.
3) Let $\mathbf{K}_g$ be the class of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}_2$ which are good, which means: if $\mathscr{A}$ is $\mathbf{x}$-dense, $\mathbf{x}$-open, see below and $B_2 \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}}$ then for some $B_2, B_1 \leq_{\mathbf{x}} B_2 \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and for all but finitely many $\eta \in \mathrm{suc}_{B_2}(\mathrm{rt}_{\mathbf{x}})$ we have $(B_2)_{\geq \eta} \in \mathscr{I}$.
4) For $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}$ we say $\mathscr{I}$ is $\mathbf{x}$ densely open when:

(*a*) $\mathscr{I} \subseteq \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_{>\mathrm{rt}(\mathbf{x})}$

(*b*) for every $B_1 \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}}$ there is B_2 such that $B_1 \leq_{\mathbf{x}} B_2 \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}}$ such that for all but finitely many $\eta \in \mathrm{suc}_B(\mathrm{rt}_{\mathbf{x}})$, there is $B_3 \in \mathrm{qsb}_{\mathbf{x}}((B_2)_{\geq \eta})$ such taht $B_3 \in \mathscr{I}$.

5) For $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}$ we say $\mathscr{I}$ is $\mathbf{x}$ open if clause (a) from part (4) and

(*c*) if $B_1 \in \mathscr{I}$ then $\mathrm{qsb}_{M_{\mathbf{x}}}(B_1) \subseteq \mathscr{I}$.

6) Let $\mathbf{K}_u$ be the set of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}_r$ for which clause $(b)(\beta)$ of Definition 2.5 holds.
7) We say $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}_r$ is large when it satisfies clause (e) of 2.5.
8) Let $\mathbf{K}_{\mathrm{ut}}$ be the set of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}$ which are ultra which means $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}_g \cap \mathbf{K}_u$ and $\mathbf{x}$ is large

- so in particular
  for every $Y \in \mathrm{frt}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathrm{rt}_{\mathbf{x}})$, the filter $D^{\mathbf{x}}_Y$ is an ultrafilter
  (equivalently for every $B \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}}$), i.e. $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}_{\mathrm{uf}}$, see Definition 1.8(6).

Claim 2.7. *Assume* $\diamondsuit_{\aleph_1}$. *In 2.5 we can add:*

(*i*) $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}_g$.

Proof. Straightforward.

Let $\mathscr{I} = \{B \in \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_{>\mathrm{rt}(\mathbf{x})} : Y \in \mathrm{alm}-\mathrm{frt}_{\mathbf{x}}(B)$ and for some $B' \in \mathrm{sb}(B)$, the function $h{\restriction}(Y \cap B')$ is constant$\}$

$(*)_1$ $\mathscr{I}$ is $\mathbf{x}$-dense.

[Why? Let $B_2 \in \mathscr{A}_{\mathbf{x}}$; as $(A_{\mathbf{x}}, \le_{\mathbf{x}})$ is directed there is $B_2 \in \mathscr{A}_{\mathbf{x}}$ such that

- $B_1 \le_{\mathbf{x}} B_2$
- $A_n \le_{\mathbf{x}} B_2$.

So for each n, there is $B'_{2,n} \in \mathrm{sb}(B_2)$ such that $n \notin \mathrm{Rang}(h{\restriction}(Y \cap B'_{2,n})$. $\square$

Claim 2.8. *If* $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}_{\mathrm{ut}}$, *i.e. in 2.5 from* $(a)(\alpha), (\beta), (b)(\alpha), (\beta), (c), (h), (h)(\gamma)$ *we can conclude*

(f) *if* $B \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}}$ *and* $Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathrm{frt}(B)$ *and* Y_2 *is above* Y_1 *then* $h^{\mathbf{x}}_{Y_2,Y_1}$ *exemplify* $D^{\mathbf{x}}_{Y_1} \le_{\mathrm{RK}} D^{\mathbf{x}}_{Y_2}$

(g) $\{D^{\mathbf{x}}_Y : Y \in \mathrm{frt}^-_{\mathbf{x}}\}$ *is* $\le_{\mathrm{RK}}$*-directed (even* $\aleph_1$*-directed)*

(h) *below* $D^{\mathbf{x}}_Y$ *there is no* P*-point.*

Proof. The main point is:
Clause (h): Let $B_1 \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}}$ be such that $B_1 \cap Y$ is an almost front of B; without loss of generality $Y \subseteq B$.

So let $h : Y \to \mathbb{N}$ be such that the set $h^{-1}\{n\}$ is $= \emptyset \mod D^{\mathbf{x}}_Y$ for every n hence there is $A_n \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}}$ which witness it and toward contradiction assume that $h(D^{\mathbf{x}}_Y)$ is a P-point; without loss of generality h is onto $\mathbb{N}$. From clause (e) of 2.5 this is immediate but we shall avoid using it. As $\mathscr{A}_{\mathbf{x}}$ is $\aleph_1$-directed by clause (a) of 2.5 without loss of generality $n < \omega \Rightarrow A_n \le_{\mathbf{x}} B_2$ and $B_1 \le_{\mathbf{x}} B_2$.

As $\mathbf{x}$ is large, apply the definition 1.11(3) of large to the pair (B_2, h') where $h'(\eta) = h(\nu)$ when $\nu \le_{M_{\mathbf{x}}} \eta \in \max(B)$ and zero if there is no such nu; as $Y \subseteq B_0$ is an almost front of B_0, h' is well defined. So there is Y_0, a front of B_0 such that for $\eta, \nu \in \max(B)$ we have $h'(\eta) = h'(\nu) \Leftrightarrow (\exists \rho \in B_1)(\rho \le_{M_{\mathbf{x}}} \eta \wedge \rho \le_{M_{\mathbf{x}}} \nu)$, clearly Y_0 is below Y, i.e. $(\forall \eta \in Y)(\exists^{\le} \nu \in Y_0)[\nu \le_{M_{\mathbf{x}}} \eta]$. Let $Z = \mathrm{suc}_{B_2}(\mathrm{rt}_{\mathbf{x}})$. So clearly the ultrafilter $D^{\mathbf{x}}_Z$ is $\le_{\mathrm{RK}} h(D^{\mathbf{x}}_Y)$, hence $D^{\mathbf{x}}$ is a P-point.

By clause (c) of 2.5 there is $B_3 \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbf{x}}$ such that $B_2 \le_{\mathbf{x}} B_3$ and $(\forall \varrho \in \mathrm{suc}_{B_2}(\mathrm{rt}_{\mathbf{x}}))(\exists^\infty \rho \in \mathrm{suc}_{B_2}(\mathrm{rt}_{\mathbf{x}}))[\varrho \le_{M_{\mathbf{x}}} \rho]$.

For each $\varrho \in \mathrm{suc}_{B_3}(\mathrm{rt}_{\mathbf{x}})$ let $Z_\varrho = \{\rho \in Z : \varrho \le_{M_{\mathbf{x}}} \rho\}$, so $\langle Z_\varrho : \rho \in \mathrm{suc}_{B_3}(\mathrm{rt}_{\mathbf{x}})$ is a partition of Z, each Z_ϱ is $= \emptyset \mod D^{\mathbf{x}}_Z$, but by the definitions of "$\mathbf{x} \in K$ and $D^{\mathbf{x}}_Z$" clearly there is no $Z' \in D^{\mathbf{x}}_Z$ such that $Z' \cap Z_\varrho$ is finite for every $\varrho \in \mathrm{suc}_{B_2}(\mathrm{rt}_{\mathbf{x}})$, contradiction to "$D^{\mathbf{x}}_Z$" is a P-point. $\square_{2.8}$

§ 3. Toward preserving $D^{\mathbf{x}}_B$

Claim 3.1. *If (A) then (B) where:*

- (A) (a) $B \in \mathrm{CWT}(T)$ *for a partial order* T, without loss of generality $T = ({}^{\omega>}\omega, \triangleleft)$
  - (b) $\mathbb{Q}$ *is a forcing notion with the COM player winning the strongly bounding game* $\Game^{\mathrm{sb}}_{\mathbb{Q}}$*, see Definition 3.6 below*
  - $(c)(\alpha)$ *forcing with* $\mathbb{Q}$ *preserving some non-principal ultrafilter on* $\mathbb{N}$ *or just*
  - (β) $([\mathbb{N}]^{\aleph_0})^{\mathbf{V}}$ *is big in* $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{Q}}$
  - (d) $p \Vdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{A} \subseteq \max(B)$"
- (B) *there are* $B', p', \mathbf{t}$
  - (a) $\mathbb{Q} \models$ "$p \le p'$"
  - (b) $B' \in \mathrm{psb}(B)$*, see 1.2(3D)*
  - (c) $\mathbf{t}$ *a truth value*
  - (d) $p' \Vdash$ "$\max(B' \subseteq \underset{\sim}{A}^{[\mathbf{t}]})$".

Remark 3.2. 1) Recall $A^{[1]} = A, A^{[0]} = \mathbb{N} \backslash A$.
2) In 3.1(A)(b) it is enough that the COM player does not lose the game $\Game^{\mathrm{sb}}_{\mathbb{Q}}$, i.e. the INC player has no winning strategy.
3) The following definition put 3.1 in frame.

Definition 3.3. [2011.7.21 redundant by 1.11, 1.12.]
1) A forcing notion $\mathbb{Q}$ is non-tree shattering when if $B \in \mathrm{CWT}(({}^{\omega>}\omega, \triangleleft))$ and $p \in \mathbb{Q}, p \Vdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{\tau} \subseteq \max(B)$" then for some $B' \in \mathrm{psb}(B)$, (from $\mathbf{V}$!) and $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ we have $p \le q$ and $q \Vdash$ "$B' \subseteq \underset{\sim}{\tau}$" or $q \Vdash$ "$B' \subseteq \max(B) \backslash \underset{\sim}{\tau}$".
2) For $B \in \mathrm{CWT}({}^{\omega>}\omega, \triangleleft)$ and $\mathscr{B} \subseteq \mathrm{psb}(B)$ we say $\mathscr{B}$ is large (in B) when for every function $\mathbf{c} : \max(B) \to \{0,1\}$ there is $B_1 \in \mathscr{B}$ such that $\mathbf{c} {\restriction} \max(B_1)$ is constant.
3) We say $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}$ is large when for every $\eta \in T_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $B \in \mathscr{A}_{\mathbf{x},\eta}$ the set $\{B' : B' \in \mathscr{A}_{\mathbf{x},\eta}$ and $B' \cap B \in \mathrm{psb}(B)\}$ is large in B.

An alternative to 3.1 with a similar proof is:

Claim 3.4. *If (A) then(B) where:*

- (A) (a) $B \in \mathrm{CWT}(T)$ *for some* T
  - (b) $\mathbb{Q}$ *is a bounding forcing (i.e. every new* $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ *is below some "old" such function)*
  - (c) *forcing with* $\mathbb{Q}$ *preserve some* P*-point*
- (B) *if* $B \in \mathrm{CTW}({}^{\omega>}\omega, \triangleleft)$ *then* $(\mathrm{psb}(B))^{\mathbf{V}}$ *is big in* $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{Q}}$*; see Definition.*

Remark 3.5. To use this for iterations we may "change our mind" about which P-point to use.

Definition 3.6. For a forcing notion $\mathbb{Q}$ and $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ we define $\Game_{\mathrm{sb}} = \Game^{\mathrm{sb}}_p = \Game^{\mathrm{sb}}_{\mathbb{Q},p}$, the strong bounding game between the null player NU and the bounding player BND, omitting p means NU chooses it in his first move; by

- (a) a play last ω moves; a play is between the player COM and INC
- (b) in the n-th move:

(α) the NU player gives a (non-empty) tree $\mathscr{T}_n$ with ω levels and no maximal node and a $\mathbb{Q}$-name $\underset{\sim}{F}_n$ of a function with domain $\mathscr{T}_n$ such that $\eta \in \mathscr{T}_n \Rightarrow p \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$F_n(\eta) \in \mathrm{suc}_{\mathscr{T}_n}(\eta)$"

(β) the BND player chooses $\eta_n \in \mathscr{T}_n$

(c) in the end of the play, the BND player wins the play iff there is $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ above p forcing, for every n, that "$(\exists k < \ell g(\eta_n))(\underset{\sim}{F}_n(\eta_n \restriction k) \leq_{\mathscr{T}_n} \eta_n \wedge k$ even)" where $\eta_n \restriction k$ is the unique $\nu \leq_{\mathscr{T}} \eta_n$ of level k.

Proof. Proof of 3.1

We prove this by induction on $\mathrm{rk}_{\mathbf{x}}(B)$, for all such B's. Let $\eta = \mathrm{rt}(B)$.

Case 1: $\mathrm{Dp}_{\mathbf{x}}(B) = 0$

Trivial as then $B = \{\eta\}$, i.e. B is a singleton so $B' = B$ can serve.

Case 2: $\mathrm{Dp}_{\mathbf{x}}(B) = 1$

Without loss of generality $\nu \in B\backslash\{\eta\} \Rightarrow \mathrm{rk}(\nu, B) = 0$. Now $|B\backslash\{\eta\}| = \aleph_0$ and we just need to find $p' \in \mathbb{Q}$ above p such that $\{\nu \in B : \nu \neq \eta$ and p' forces $\nu \in \underset{\sim}{A}$ or forces $\nu \notin \underset{\sim}{A}\}$ is infinite. As $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "no $\underset{\sim}{X} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ shatters $\mathscr{P}(\mathbb{N})^{\mathbf{V}}$", this is possible.

Case 3: $\alpha = \mathrm{Dp}_{\mathbf{x}}(B) > 1$

Let $Y = \mathrm{suc}_{\mathbf{x}}(\eta, B)$ so for $\nu \in Y$ we have $\mathrm{Dp}_{\mathbf{x}}(B^{[\nu]}) < \alpha$, hence the induction hypothesis applies to $B^{[\nu]}$, let $\langle \nu_n : \nu \in \mathbb{N}\rangle$ list Y.

We simulate a play of $\Game^{\mathrm{sb}}_{\mathbb{Q},p}$ with the BND player using a winning strategy such that in the n-th move the NU player acts such that:

$(*)_1$ (a) $\mathscr{T}_n = \{\langle B_0, \ldots, B_{k-1}\rangle : k \in \mathbb{N}, B_\ell \in \mathrm{psb}(B^{[\nu_n]})$ for $\ell < k$ and $B_{\ell+1} \subseteq B_\ell$ if $\ell + 1 < k\}$

(b) $<_{\mathscr{T}_n}$ is being an initial segment

(c) $\underset{\sim}{F}_n(\langle B_0, \ldots, B_{k-1}\rangle)$ is $\langle B_0, \ldots, B_{k-1}, B'\rangle$ for some member B' of $\mathrm{psb}(B_k)$ from $\mathbf{V}$ such that $\max(B') \subseteq \underset{\sim}{A} \vee \max(B') \cap \underset{\sim}{A} = \emptyset$.

There is such a function $\underset{\sim}{F}_n$ because of the induction hypothesis.

Clearly we can do this. As the player BND has used a winning strategy, COM has won the play so there is q such that

$(*)_2$ (a) $q \in \mathbb{Q}$

(b) $\mathbb{Q} \models$ "$p \leq q$"

(c) $q \Vdash$ "for every n for some even $k <$ $\mathrm{level}_{\mathscr{T}_n}(\eta_n)$ we have $\underset{\sim}{F}_n(\eta_n \restriction k) \leq_{\mathscr{T}_n} \eta_n$".

Hence by the choice of $(\mathscr{T}_n, \underset{\sim}{F}_m)$, letting $\eta_n = \langle B_{n,0}, \ldots, B_{n,k(n)}\rangle$

$(*)_3$ for some $\langle \underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}}_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\rangle$

(α) $B_{n,k(n)} \in \mathrm{psb}(B_{[\geq \nu_n]})$

(β) $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}}_n$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-name of the truth value

(γ) $q \Vdash$ "if $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}}_n = 1$ then $\max(B_{n,k(n)}) \subseteq \underset{\sim}{A}$ and if $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}}_n = 0$ then $\max(B_{n,k(n)}), \underset{\sim}{A} = \emptyset$".

Now by clause $(c)(\beta)$ of the claim assumption

$(*)$ there is an infinite $\mathscr{U} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, truth value $\mathbf{t}$ and r such that $q \leq_{\mathbb{Q}} r$ and $r \Vdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}}_n = \mathbf{t}$ for $n \in \mathscr{U}$".

Lastly, let $B_* = \cup\{B_{n,k(n)} : n \in \mathscr{U}\} \cup \{\eta\}$ and clearly B_*, r are as required. $\square_{3.1}$

Definition 3.7. 1) For a forcing notion $\mathbb{Q}$ and $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ we define a game $\Game_{\rm bd} = \Game^{\rm bd}_p = \Game^{\rm bd}_{\mathbb{Q},p}$; omitting p means that the player NU chooses it in his first move; by

- (a) a play last ω-moves
- (b) in the n-th move
  - (α) the NU player gives a $\mathbb{Q}$-name $\underset{\sim}{\tau}_n$ of a member of $\mathbf{V}$ and then
  - (β) the BND player gives a finite set $w_n \subseteq \mathbf{V}$
- (c) in the end of the play the COM player wins the play iff there is $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ above p forcing "$\underset{\sim}{\tau}_n \in w_n$" for every n.

2) The game $\Game^{\rm bd}_{\mathbb{Q},p,f}$ where $\mathbb{Q}$ is a forcing notion and $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}\backslash\{0\}$ going to infinity, is defined similarly, but we demand $|w_n| \le f(n)$.
3) We say the forcing notion $\mathbb{Q}$ is (f,g)-bounding when $f, g \in {}^{\mathbb{N}}(\mathbb{N}\backslash\{0\}), g \le f$ and for every $\eta \in (\prod\limits_n (f(n))^{\mathbf{V}[\mathbb{Q}]}$ there is $\bar{w} \in (\prod\limits_n [f(n)]^{g(n)})^{\mathbf{V}}$ such that $(\forall n)(\eta(n) \in w_n)$.

Recalling Definition 1.11, 1.12

Claim 3.8. *1) If (A) below and $B \in \mathrm{CTW}(M)^{\mathbf{V}}$ then $(\mathrm{psb}(B))^{\mathbf{V}}$ is large in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{Q}}$.*
2) If (A) + (B) below then in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathbf{x}$ is large; where

- (A) (a) *$\mathbb{Q}$ is a proper forcing notion*
  - (b) *D_* is a Ramsey ultrafilter in $\mathbf{V}$*
  - (c) *$\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$\mathrm{fil}(D_*)$ is a Ramsey ultrafilter*
  - (d) *$\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$D^{\mathbf{x}}_Y$ is an ultrafilter, equivalently $(D^{\mathbf{x}}_Y)^{\mathbf{V}}$ generates one"*
- (B) (a) *$\mathbf{x}$ is as in 4.1, i.e. $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}_g$ (see Definition 2.6)*
  - (b) *$\mathbf{x}$ is full, i.e. if $B_1 \in \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta, \eta \ne \mathrm{tr}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $B_2 \in \mathrm{psb}(B_1)$ then $B_2 \in \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{x}}_\eta$.*

Proof. 1) We prove this by induction on $\mathrm{Dp}(B)$, let $\mathbf{c} : \max(B) \to \mathbb{N}$ be from $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{Q}}$ and we should find (B^1, Y) as promised. If $\mathrm{Dp}(B) = 0$, i.e. $|B| = 1$ this is trivial.

If $\mathrm{Dp}(B) = 1$ let $\langle \eta_n : \eta \in \mathbb{N}\rangle \in \mathbf{V}$ list $\mathrm{suc}_B(\mathrm{rt}_B)$: by (A),(C) in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{Q}}$, for some $A \in \mathrm{fil}(D_*)$ the sequence $\langle \mathbf{c}(\eta_n) : n \in A\rangle$ is constant or without repetitions, so by (A)(c), without loss of generality $A \in D_* \subseteq \mathbf{V}$ and $\{\mathrm{rt}_B\} \cup \{\eta_n : n \in A\}$ is as required.

So assume $\mathrm{Dp}(B) > 1$. Without loss of generality $0 \notin \mathrm{Rang}(\mathbf{c})$. For $\nu \in B\backslash \max(B)$ let $\langle \eta_{\nu,n} : n \in \mathbb{N}\rangle$ list $\mathrm{suc}_B(\mathrm{rt}_{\mathbf{x}})$ and without loss of generality the function $(\nu, n) \mapsto \eta_{\nu,n}$ belongs to $\mathbf{V}$. By downward induction on $\nu \in B$ we choose $(k_\nu, A_\nu) = (k(\nu), A_\nu)$

- $(*)$ (a) $k_\nu \in \mathbb{N}$
  - (b) $A_\nu \in D_*$
  - (c) if $\nu \in \max(B)$ then $k_n = \mathbf{c}(\nu)$ so > 0
  - (d) if $\nu \notin \max(B)$ then $(\alpha)_\nu$ or $(\beta)_\nu$ where
    - $(\alpha)_\nu$ $k_\nu = 0$ and $\langle k(\eta_{\nu,n}) : n \in A_\nu\rangle$ is with no repetitions, all non-zero
    - $(\beta)_\nu$ $\langle k(\eta_{\nu,n}) : n \in A_\nu\rangle$ is constantly k_ν.

[Why we can? This is possible by (A)(c).]

$(*)$ for $\nu, \rho \in B \backslash \max(B)$ choose $A_{\nu,\rho} \in D_*$ such that either $n \in A_{\nu,\rho} \Rightarrow k(\eta_{\rho,n}) = k(\eta_{\nu,n})$ or $\{k(\eta_{\rho,n}) : n \in A_{\nu,\ell}\}$ is disjoint to $\{k(\eta_{\nu,n}) : n \in A_{\nu,\rho}\}$ needed?

Now by (A)(c) there is A_* such that

$(*)$ (a) $A_* \in \mathrm{fil}(D_*)$
- (b) $\nu \in B \backslash \max(B) \Rightarrow A_* \subseteq^* A_\nu$
- (c) if $\nu, \rho \in B \backslash \max(B) \Rightarrow$ then $A_* \subseteq^* A_{\nu,\rho} \vee A_* \subseteq^* (\mathbb{N} \backslash A_{\nu,\rho})$
- (d) without loss of generality $A_* \in D_*$.

Let $\langle \nu_n : n \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$ list $B \backslash \max(B)$ and let f_1 be the function with domain $B \backslash \max(B)$ such that $f_1(\nu) = \{\eta_{\nu,n} : n \in A_\nu \backslash A_*\} \in [\mathrm{suc}_B(\nu)]^{<\aleph_0}$.

As the forcing $\mathbb{Q}$ is bounding, there is a function $f_2 \in \mathbf{V}$ with domain $B \backslash \max(B)$ such that $\nu \in f_1(\nu) \subseteq f_2(\nu) \in [\mathrm{suc}_B(\nu)]^{<\aleph_0}$. Clearly

$(*)$ $B_1 \in \mathrm{psb}(B)^{\mathbf{V}}$ where $B_1 = A_{B,f} = \{\nu \in B$: if $\rho \in B$ satisfies $\mathrm{rt}_{\mathbf{x}} \leq_B \rho <_B \nu$ and n is such that $\eta_{\rho,n} \leq_B \nu$ then $n \in A_*$ but $\eta_{\rho,n} \notin f_2(\nu)\}$.

Also, let

$(*)$ $Y = \{\nu \in B_1 : k_\nu \neq 0$ and $\rho <_B \nu \Rightarrow k_\rho = 0\}$.

Now

$(*)$ (a) Y is a front of B_1
- (b) if $\nu \in Y$ then $\mathbf{c} \restriction (B_1)_{\geq \nu}$ is constantly k_ν

$(*)$ there is $B_2 \in \mathrm{psb}(B_1)^{\mathbf{V}}$ such that: if $\nu \in B_2 \backslash \max(B_2)$ and $\mathrm{suc}_{B_2}(\nu)$ is not disjoint to Y then $\mathrm{suc}_{B_1}(\nu) \subseteq Y$.

[Why? Similar to the above proof. In fact

- if $B' \in \mathrm{CTW}(M)^{\mathbf{V}}, \mathbf{d}$ is a function with domain B' then for some $B'' \in \mathrm{psb}(B')^{\mathbf{V}}$, for every $\eta \in B'' \backslash \max(B''), \mathbf{d} \restriction \mathrm{suc}(\eta, B'')$ is constant or one-to-one.

If $Y = \{\mathrm{rt}_{\mathbf{x}}\}$ we are done, so assume not and let

$(*)$ $Z = \{\eta \in B_2 : \eta \notin \max(B_2)$ and $\mathrm{suc}_{B_2}(\eta) \subseteq Y\}$.

So

$(*)$ Z is a front of B_2.

Also if $Z = \{\mathrm{rt}_{B_2}\}$ we are done so assume not and let $\langle \nu_n : n \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$ list Z. As $\mathrm{fil}(D_*)$ is a Ramsey ultrafilter we can find $\bar{n}$ such that

$(*)$ (a) $\bar{n} = \langle n_i = n(i) : i \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$ is increasing
- (b) $\bar{n}$ list a member of D_* hence $\in \mathbf{V}$
- (c) if $i \geq \ell$ then $\eta_{\nu_\ell, n_i} \in B_2$
- (d) if $i_1 < i_2$ then $\{k(\eta_{\nu_i, n(i_1)}) : \ell \leq \ell_1\}$ and $\{k(\eta_{\nu_\ell, n(i_2)}) : \ell \leq i_2\}$ are disjoint.

Lastly, as $n(i) \in \mathbf{V}$ we can find in $\mathbf{V}$ a partition $\langle C_\ell : \ell \in \mathbb{N}\rangle$ of $\mathbb{N}$ to infinite sets and let $B_3 = \{\varrho$: if $\nu_\ell <_{B_2} \varrho$ and for some $i \in C_\ell, i > \ell$ and $\eta_{\nu_\ell, n(i)} \leq_{B_2} \varrho\}$.

Easily $B_3 \in \mathbf{V}, B_3 \in \mathrm{psb}(B_2)$ and is as required.]

2) FILL.

3) We use "for $\mathscr{I}$ dense open...". $\square_{3.8}$

Definition 3.9. 1) For a forcing notion $\mathbb{Q}$ and $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ we define a game $\Game_{\mathrm{ufbd}} = \Game^{\mathrm{ufbd}}_p = \Game^{\mathrm{ufbd}}_{\mathbb{Q},p}$; omitting p means that the player NU chooses it in his first move; by

- (a) a play last ω-moves
- (b) in the n-th move
  - (α) the NU player chooses an ultrafilter E_n on some set I_n from $\mathbf{V}$ and a $\mathbb{Q}$-name $\underset{\sim}{E}^+_n$ of an ultrafilter on I_n extending E_n and a $\mathbb{Q}$-name $\underset{\sim}{X}_n$ of a member of $\underset{\sim}{E}^+_n$
  - (β) the BND player chooses $t_n \in I_n$
- (c) in the end of the play the BND player wins the play <u>iff</u> there is $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ above p forcing "$t_n \in \underset{\sim}{X}_n$" for every n.

2) For a forcing notion $\mathbb{Q}$ and $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ we define a game $\Game_{\mathrm{vfbd}} = \Game^{\mathrm{vfbd}}_p = \Game^{\mathrm{vfbd}}_{\mathbb{Q},p}$ as in (1) but $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{X}_n \in E_n$ or just include a member of E_n" so $\underset{\sim}{E}^+_n$ is redundant.

Observation 3.10. Let $\mathbb{Q}$ be a forcing notion.

1) If BND wins in $\Game^{\mathrm{sb}}_{\mathbb{Q},p}$ <u>then</u> BND wins in $\Game^{\mathrm{bd}}_{\mathbb{Q},p}$ which implies that $\mathbb{Q}$ is a bounding forcing.

2) The player BND wins in $\Game^{\mathrm{sb}}_{\mathbb{Q},p}$ <u>iff</u> BND wins in $\Game^{\mathrm{vfbd}}_{\mathbb{Q},p}$.

3) If the player BND wins in $\Game^{\mathrm{ufbd}}_{\mathbb{Q}.p}$ <u>then</u> BND wins in $\Game^{\mathrm{vfbd}}_{\mathbb{Q},p}$.

4) We can replace in 1) - 3) above "wins" by "do not lose".

Proof. 1) The second implication is obvious, so we concentrate on the first. For every $\underset{\sim}{\tau}$, a $\mathbb{Q}$-name of an ordinal we define a pair $(T_{\underset{\sim}{\tau}}, \underset{\sim}{F}_{\underset{\sim}{\tau}})$ as follows:

$(*)_1$ (a) let $u = \{\alpha :\nVdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\tau} \neq \alpha$"$\}$ it is a set of $|\mathbb{Q}|$ ordinals, non-empty

(b) $T_{\underset{\sim}{\tau}}$ is the tree $\{\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega>}u\}$, i.e. order by $\triangleleft$ being an initial segment

(c) $\underset{\sim}{F}_{\underset{\sim}{\tau}}(\eta) = \eta\char`^\langle \underset{\sim}{\tau}\rangle$ for $\eta \in T_{\underset{\sim}{\tau}}$.

Clearly

$(*)_2$ (a) $T_{\underset{\sim}{\tau}}$ is in $\mathbf{V}$, a tree with ω levels

(b) $\underset{\sim}{F}_{\underset{\sim}{\tau}}$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-name of a function with domain $\underset{\sim}{F}$ such that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{F}_{\underset{\sim}{\tau}}(\eta) \in \mathrm{suc}_{T_{\underset{\sim}{\tau}}}(\eta)$".

[Why? Read the definitions.]

$(*)_3$ if $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $\eta \in T_{\underset{\sim}{\tau}}$ (so $\mathrm{Rang}(\eta)$ is a finite subset of u) then the following are equivalent:

(a) $q \Vdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{\tau} \in \mathrm{Rang}(\eta)$"

(b) $q \Vdash$ "for some $\nu \triangleleft \eta$" we have $q \Vdash$ "$\nu\char`^\langle \underset{\sim}{F}_{\underset{\sim}{\tau}}(\nu)\rangle \trianglelefteq \eta$".

[Why? Read the definitions.]

So clearly playing the game $\Game^{\rm bd}_{\mathbb{Q},p}$ we can "translate" it to a play of $\Game^{\rm sb}_{\mathbb{Q},p}$ replacing the NU choice of $\underset{\sim}{\tau}_n$ to the choice of $(T_{\underset{\sim}{\tau}}, \underset{\sim}{F}_{\underset{\sim}{\tau}})$. So for every strategy $\mathbf{st}_1$ of COM in $\Game^{\rm sb}_{\mathbb{Q},p}$ we can translate it to a strategy $\mathbf{st}_2$ of the player BND in $\Game^{\rm bd}_{\mathbb{Q},p}$, and finish easily.

2) We now need two translations.

Translating $\mathbb{Q}^{\rm vfbd}_{\mathbb{Q},p}$ to $\Game^{\rm bd}_{\mathbb{Q},p}$:

So we are given a choice $y = (I, E, \underset{\sim}{X}) \in \mathbf{Y}_{{\rm vfbd},\mathbb{Q}}$, of INC, as in 3.9(1)($\alpha$), i.e.

- $\bullet_1$ $I \in \mathbf{V}$
- $\bullet_2$ E an ultrafilter on I, in $\mathbf{V}$
- $\bullet_3$ $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{X} \in E$ or just include a member $\underset{\sim}{X}'$ of E".

Now

($*$) if $q \Vdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{X}' \in \mathscr{W}$" where $\mathscr{W} \subseteq E$ is finite ($\mathscr{W}$ an object in $\mathbf{V}$ not a name), then $\cap\{A : A \in \mathscr{W}\}$ is non-empty and $t \in \cap\{A : A \in cW\} \Rightarrow q \Vdash$ "$t \in \underset{\sim}{X}' \subseteq \underset{\sim}{X}$".

Translating $\Game^{\rm bd}_{\mathbb{Q},p}$ to $\Game^{\rm vfbd}_{\mathbb{Q},p}$:

Given $y = (I_1, \underset{\sim}{\tau}), \underset{\sim}{\tau}$ a $\mathbb{Q}$-name of a member I_1 of $\mathbf{V}$ we define $I_y = [I_1]^{<\aleph_0} \in \mathbf{V}$ and choose $E_y \in \mathbf{V}$ an ultrafilter on I_y such that $u_* \in [I_1]^{<\aleph_0} \Rightarrow \{u \in [I_1]^{<\aleph_0} : u_* \subseteq u\} \in E$; lastly we choose

$$\underset{\sim}{X}_y = \{u \in [I_1]^{<\aleph_0} : \underset{\sim}{\tau} \in u\}.$$

So $(I_y, E_y, \underset{\sim}{X}_y)$ is a legal move in $\Game^{\rm vfbd}_{\mathbb{Q},p}$ and

($*$) if $q \Vdash$ "$t \in X_{\mathbf{y}}$" then $q \Vdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{\tau} \in t$", t a finite subset of I_1".

3) Obvious.

4) The same proof. $\square_{3.10}$

Claim 3.11. *Assume* $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} = \langle \mathbb{P}_\alpha, \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta : \alpha \leq \alpha(*), \beta < \alpha(*) \rangle$ *is a CS-iteration of proper forcing.*

If $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta$ *is strongly bounding (in* $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}_\beta}$ *for* $\beta < \alpha(*)$*) then* $P_{\alpha(*)}$ *is strongly bounding (hence* $\mathbb{P}_\beta/\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ *is strongly bounding in* $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}_\alpha}$ *for every* $\alpha \leq \beta \leq \alpha(*)$*).*

Proof. Straight, using the characterization by the game $\Game^{\rm vfbd}_{\mathbb{Q},p}$, see Definition 3.9(2) and Observation 3.10(2). $\square_{3.11}$

§ 4. Specific Forcing Notions

§ 4(A). On $\mathbb{Q}^2_D$.

See [Sh:F1091], [Sh:594]. Note that the forcing of [Sh:F1091, §1] is not O.K. as it makes every old ultrafilter on $\mathbb{N}$ not generate an ultrafilter in the extension.

Definition 4.1. For D a non-principal ultrafilter on $\mathbb{N}$ let $\mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{Q}^2_D$ be the following forcing notion:

- (A) $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ iff p consists of
  - (a) $\mathscr{U} = \mathscr{U}_p = \emptyset$ mod D, i.e. $\mathbb{N} \backslash \mathscr{U} \in D$
  - (b) $f = f_p$, a function from $\mathbb{N}$ to $\{-1, 1\}$
  - (c) $E = E_p$, an equivalence relation on $\mathbb{N} \backslash \mathscr{U}$
  - (d) if $n \in \mathbb{N} \backslash \mathscr{U}$ then $(n/E_p) = \emptyset \mod D$
- (B) $\mathbb{Q} \models$ "$p \le q$" iff
  - (a) $p, q \in \mathbb{Q}$
  - (b) $\mathscr{U}_p \subseteq \mathscr{U}_q$
  - (c) $\mathscr{U}_q \backslash \mathscr{U}_p$ is E_p-closed, i.e. $n_1 E_p n_2 \Rightarrow (n_1 \in \mathscr{U}_q \equiv n_2 \in \mathscr{U}_q)$
  - (d) $E_p {\restriction} \mathscr{U}_q$ refine E_q
  - (e) if $n \in \mathbb{N} \backslash \mathscr{U}_p$ then $f_q {\restriction} (n/E_p)$ is $\pm f_p {\restriction} (n/E_p)$.

Definition 4.2. For $\mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{Q}^2_D$:
1)

- (a) $\mathrm{First}(p) = \{n : n \notin \mathscr{U}_p$ and $n = \min(n/E_p\}$,
- (b) $\mathrm{first}_n(p) =$ the n-th member of $\mathrm{First}(p)$,
- (c) $\mathrm{first}_{<n}(p) = \{\mathrm{first}_k(p) : k < n\}$.

2) $p \le_{\mathrm{pr},n} q$ means

- (a) $p \le q$
- (b) $\mathscr{U}_p = \mathscr{U}_q$
- (c) if $k \in \mathrm{first}_n(p)$ then $k/E_q = k/E_k$ hence $\mathrm{first}_{<n}(p) = \mathrm{first}_{<n}(q)$.

3) For $p \in \mathbb{Q}, n < \omega, \eta \in {}^n\{1, -1\}$ let $q = p^{[\eta]}$ be defined by

- (a) $\mathscr{U}_q = \mathscr{U}_p \cup \{\bigcup\{m/E_p : m \in$ $\mathrm{first}_{<n}(p)\}\}$
- (b) $E_q = E_p {\restriction} (\mathbb{N} \backslash \mathscr{U}_p)$
- (c) $f_q {\restriction} \mathscr{U}_p = f_p {\restriction} \mathscr{U}_p$
- (d) $f_q {\restriction} (\mathbb{N} \backslash \mathscr{U}_q) = f_p {\restriction} (\mathbb{N} \backslash \mathscr{U}_q)$ or just $n \in \mathbb{N} \backslash \mathscr{U}_q \Rightarrow f_q {\restriction} (n/E_q) = \pm (f_p {\restriction} (n/E_p))$
- (e) if $m \in \mathrm{first}_{<n}(p)$ then $f_q {\restriction} (m/E_p) = \eta(m) \times f_p {\restriction} (m/E_p)$.

4) $p \le_{\mathrm{apr},n} q$ iff $q \in \{p^{[\eta]} : \eta \in {}^n\{1, -1\}\}$.

Remark 4.3. Do we in the Definition preserve convexity? No, we allow infinite parts but the partition is discussed below.

Claim 4.4. *For D a P-point or just a non-principal ultrafilter on* $\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{Q}^2_D$ *satisfies*
1) $\mathbb{Q}$ *is a proper forcing of cardinality* $2^{\aleph_0}$.
2) COM *wins in the game* $\partial^{\rm bd}_{\mathbb{Q},p}$ *and even in* $\partial^{\rm bd}_{\mathbb{Q},p,f}$ *for* $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ *and* $f \in {}^{\mathbb{N}}(\mathbb{N})\backslash\{0\}$ *which goes to infinity.*
3) $\mathbb{Q}^2_D$ *has the* (f,g)*-bounding property* *__when__* $f,g \in {}^{\mathbb{N}}(\mathbb{N}\backslash\{0\})$ *are increasing,* $g \le f$ *and* $0 = \lim\{g(n)/f(n) : n < \omega\}$.
4) $\mathbb{Q}$ *has the* PP*-property, see* [Sh:f, Ch.VI].

Remark 4.5. 1) Now then in [Sh:f, Ch.VI,§4] the forcing does not have "COM win the play $\partial^{\rm bd}_{\mathbb{Q},p,f}$".
2) But in [Sh:594] it does.

Proof. Proof of 4.4
1) Easy, using the properties of $\le_{{\rm pr},n}$.
2),3),4) Follows. $\square_{4.4}$

The following is closer to [Sh:f, Ch.VI,§4] and can be used similarly but later we use another way.

Definition 4.6. Let $\underset{\sim}{A}$ be the generic of $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}^2_D$, i.e. $\cup\{f_p{\restriction}\mathscr{U}_p : p \in \underset{\sim}{\mathbf{G}}_{\mathbb{Q}_\alpha}\}$.
2) Let $\mathbb{Q}^{2,*}_D = (\mathbb{Q}^2_D)^{\mathbb{N}}$, the product of $\aleph_0$ many copies of $\mathbb{Q}^2_D$.

Claim 4.7. *1) If D is a non-principal ultrafilter on* $\mathbb{N}$ *then* $\Vdash_{\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}^2_D}$ "$\underset{\sim}{A} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ *is a new subset of* $\mathbb{N}, \underset{\sim}{A} \ne \emptyset$ *mod D".*
2) For D a non-principal ultrafilter (or P-point) forcing with $\mathbb{Q}^{2,*}_D$ *has the properties of* $\mathbb{Q}^2_D$ *from 4.4.*

Remark 4.8. Compare with way B below.

Proof. As in [Sh:f, Ch.VI,§4]. $\square_{4.7}$

Remark 4.9. To prove the consistency of "$\mathfrak{u} = \aleph_2 +$ no P-point" iterating $\mathbb{Q}^2_D$ is not enough, we need a relative $\mathbb{Q}^3_D$, which presently is in [Sh:F1127, §(5A)].

References

[Bla] Andreas Blass, *Combinatorial Cardinal Characteristics of the Continuum*, Handbook of Set Theory (Matthew Foreman and Akihiro Kanamori, eds.), vol. 1, Springer, pp. 395–490.

[vD84] Eric K. van Douwen, *The integers and topology*, Handbook of Set-Theoretic Topology (K. Kunen and J. E. Vaughan, eds.), Elsevier Science Publishers, 1984, pp. 111–167.

[Sh:f] Saharon Shelah, *Proper and improper forcing*, Perspectives in Mathematical Logic, Springer, 1998.

[BsSh:242] Andreas Blass and Saharon Shelah, *There may be simple $P_{\aleph_1}$- and $P_{\aleph_2}$-points and the Rudin-Keisler ordering may be downward directed*, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic **33** (1987), 213–243.

[Sh:594] Saharon Shelah, *There may be no nowhere dense ultrafilter*, Proceedings of the Logic Colloquium Haifa'95 (Makowsky, J.A. and Ravve, E.V., ed.), Lecture Notes in Logic, vol. 11, Springer, 1998, math.LO/9611221, pp. 305–324.

[Sh:630] ______, *Properness Without Elementaricity*, Journal of Applied Analysis **10** (2004), 168–289, math.LO/9712283.

[Sh:666] ______, *On what I do not understand (and have something to say:) Part I*, Fundamenta Mathematicae **166** (2000), 1–82, math.LO/9906113.

[Sh:830] ______, *The combinatorics of reasonable ultrafilters*, Fundamenta Mathematicae **192** (2006), 1–23, math.LO/0407498.

[RoSh:890] Andrzej Roslanowski and Saharon Shelah, *Reasonable ultrafilters, again*, Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic **52** (2011), 113–147, math.LO/0605067.

[Sh:F1091] Saharon Shelah, *P-point and no Q-point.*

[Sh:F1127] ______, *Ultrafilters on $\aleph_1$ generated by few conditions.*

Einstein Institute of Mathematics, Edmond J. Safra Campus, Givat Ram, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, 91904, Israel, and, Department of Mathematics, Hill Center - Busch Campus, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 110 Frelinghuysen Road, Piscataway, NJ 08854-8019 USA

E-mail address: `shelah@math.huji.ac.il`

URL: `http://shelah.logic.at`